

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated March 24, 2006, the Examiner indicated that claims 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9-15 would be allowable if placed in independent form; rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 16-20 as being unpatentable over “Programmed for Perfection” (hereinafter Programmed), Applicants’ specification at paragraphs 1 and 2, and further in view of “Casino Data Systems-Going Public the IPO Reporter” (hereinafter Going-Public). Applicants have amended claims 19 and 20 to correct misspellings and have amended allowable claims 3, 7, and 10-15 to place them in independent form. The limitation of allowable claim 9 has been added to independent claims 1 and 17, the limitation of allowable claim 13 has been added to independent claim 18, and claim 9 has been canceled.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s reasoning in support of his § 103(a) rejection. As stated in the previous response, the claimed invention involves a customer value specific to a property that is also based on the customer’s activities at two or more properties. Applicants also disagree with the Examiner’s contention that the subject matter of claims 19 and 20 do not recite patentable distinctions. The nature of the activities is important in determining a valuation. Gambling activities lead to values such as “amount won,” and “amount lost,” which can be used in determining valuation. Other types of activities such as staying in hotels or eating in restaurants do not result in the same type of information. Thus, the type of activity being monitored does make a patentable distinction.

To expedite prosecution, however, applicants have placed the allowable claims in independent form and have added the limitations of allowable claim 9 to independent claims 1 and 17 and have further added the limitations of allowable claim 13 to independent claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the proposed claim amendments, which should not require a new search.


Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 and 10-20, as presented herein, patentably distinguish over the cited reference (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
DAVID P. KOWAL, JOHN J.
BOUSHY AND TIMOTHY J.
WILMOTT

Date: August 24, 2006

By: 

Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7152
Fax: (650) 938-5200